REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Summary

This Amendment is being filed together with a Request for Continued Examination. Entry of the Amendment is requested prior to further examination.

Claims 1-11 are pending in the application. Claims 5-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Rassen et al (U.S. 6,189,004). Claims 1-4 and 7-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rassen et al (U.S. 6,189,004) in view of Cochrane et al (U.S. 6,532,470).

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections in view of the following arguments.

Discussion of Amended Claims

Claims 1, 5, 7 and 10 are amended to more particularly describe the subject matter of the present invention. In particular, claim 1 is amended to specify that a join is eliminated and to incorporate the subject matter of now cancelled claim 3. Claim 5 is amended to more distinctly specify the composition of the alias table and the function of the database manager. Claim 7 is amended to specify that a join is eliminated and to incorporate the subject matter of now cancelled claim 8. Claim 10 is amended to specify that the database manager is adapted to replace the aliases with the actual values of the leaf nodes and avoid additional joins.

Claim 3 and claim 8 have been cancelled since the subject matter thereof has been incorporated into claim 1 and claim 7 respectively.

Arguments

35 U.S.C. 102(a) Rejections

Claims 5-6 stand rejected as being anticipated by Rassen. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants' claim 5 relates to a query for use by a database manager to extract information from a relational database. The claim has been amended to recite, *inter alia,* an alias table comprising an alias table alias field and an aliased value field. The claim has been further amended to specify that the database manager is adapted to replace the hub table alias with an aliased value from the aliased value field by way of an alias table alias from the alias table alias field, thereby avoiding at least one join in the reduced query. For example, an alias table for a dimension table contains an alias (the key field value in the hub table used to index into the dimension table) for each value of the field of the dimension table referred to in the joining SQL statement, e.g. as disclosed in Applicants' specification at page 11, lines 5-10. The select clause provides the advantage of avoiding processing time required for joining individual fields of the query. Instead, the alias table provides a comparison table by which a hub table can be analyzed according to specified query fields without joining fields in the query. The output of the select clause enables the database manager to provide a final response while avoiding at least one join.

Rassen does not disclose or suggest these features of Applicants' claims. The Examiner cites Rassen at col. 41 to suggest that Rassen discloses an alias table as claimed by Applicants. Rassen at col. 41 is a recitation of a sample code for a datamart wherein a table is created for population with information regarding whether the field is contained in an aggregate that can be utilized for faster processing in the current query. Rassen at col. 41 does not disclose or suggest an alias table comprising an alias table alias field and an aliased value field. The aliasing provided by Rassen merely renames the existing tables and does not provide a new, unique table including the alias table alias field and an aliased value field. Moreover, Rassen at col. 41 does not disclose or suggest a database manager to replace the hub table alias with the aliased field value to avoid the use of at least one join. The process disclosed in Rassen at col. 41 clearly shows the use of joins to provide the final output.

By way of example, a comparison of the SQL commands required for different methods is provided.

Standard SQL:

select Customer.Name, sum(SalesTable.Amount) from Customer, SalesTable where **Customer.CustomerID = SalesTable.CustomerID**

Changes Suggested by Rassen:

select T1.Name, sum(T2.Amount) from Customer T1, SalesTable T2 where **T1.CustomerID = T2.CustomerID**

Changes, by way of example, per Applicants' claims:

select Customer.Name, Customer.CustomerID from Customer; // Creates alias Table

select SalesTable.CustomerID, sum(SalesTable.Amount) from SalesTable // creates output table used by database manager to eliminate a join between Customer.CustomerID and SalesTable.CustomerID.

Therefore, it should be appreciated that Rassen clearly does not eliminate the use of a join. Thus, Rassen neither anticipates nor renders obvious Applicants' claimed invention as set forth in claims 5-6.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejections

Claims 1-4 and 7-11 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Rassen in view of Cochrane. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above with reference to the 102(a) rejection, Rassen does not disclose or suggest an <u>alias table comprising an alias table alias field and an aliased value field</u>. Further, Rassen does not disclose a process for <u>avoiding</u> the use of at least one <u>join</u>. Cochrane also does not disclose or suggest using the database manager in combination with an alias table to eliminate the use of joins.

Accordingly, Applicants' independent claims 1, 5, 7 and 10 and each of the claims dependent thereon are clearly patentable over the cited references.

Further remarks regarding the asserted relationship between Applicants' claims and the prior art are not deemed necessary, in view of the amended claims and the foregoing discussion. Applicants' silence as to any of the Examiner's comments is not indicative of an acquiescence to the stated grounds of rejection.

In view of the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the present application, allow each of the pending claims, and to pass this application on to issue. If there are any remaining matters that need to be addressed in order to place this application into condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Barry R. Lipsitz
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 28,637
Law Office of Barry R. Lipsitz
755 Main Street
Monroe, CT 06468
(203) 459-0200

Attorney Docket No.: IMRS-364
Date: June 3, 2005